

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/030,992	01/16/2002	Mitsuru Uesugi	L9289.02101	9109	
24257 75	590 08/02/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER, LLP 1615 L STREET, NW			ROBERTS,	ROBERTS, BRIAN S	
SUITE 850	1,1444		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036		2616			
		DATE MAILED: 08/02/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action							
Before the Filing of an Ap	peal Brief						

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)	
10/030,992	UESUGI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Brian Roberts	2616		

	Brian Roberts	2616					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 14 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI '06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exampler 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	ctension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig to than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complising the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.</li> </ol>	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since				
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		I E below);					
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be</li> </ul>	DW); ottor form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(c) iney are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	etter form for appear by materially re	ducing or simplifying	110 133403 101				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		•	,				
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	allowable if submitted in a separate,						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) chiested to 23	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☑ wi ovided below or appended.	ill be entered and an o	explanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: <u>22</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>14-21 and 23-25</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered b <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		NI /	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s).	1/22				
13.  Other:		HASSAN KIZOU	KAMINER				
		THE STREET STREET	2600				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not convincing. The Examiner has reviewed the record and believes the rejection of claims 14-21 and 23-25 to be proper.

The applicant contends that McChesney does not disclose that a transmission side apparatus (1) dectects a capacity necessary for demodulation by a receiving side apparatus based on a reported reception quality and (2) determines a capacity for data retransmission based on the detected demodulation capacity and traffic conditions.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In Figure 3, McChesney suggest a source radio (transmission side apparatus) that detects capacity necessary for demodulation by receiving from a destination radio (receiving side appartus) a NACK packet (retransmission request signal) containing the channel quality measurement and the source radio utilizes the channel quality information (demodulation capacity and traffic conditions) to determine the power level and information rate (capacity for data retransmission) for the next transmission to the destination radio wherein the next transmission maybe a re-transmission of a previously transmitted packet (data) that previously resulted in a NACK (retransmission request sigal). (pg. 263, column 2, paragraph 3)